UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/314,123	05/19/1999	NOBUAKI MIYAHARA	35.G2391	4726

5514 7590 05/21/2002

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
TRAN, DOUGLAS Q	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	5

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/314,123	MIYAHARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Douglas Q. Tran	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 6-15 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ohnishi et al. (US Patent No. 5,655,152) and Dash et al. (US Patent No. 6,069,624).

As to claim 6, Ohnishi teaches:

Connection means for connecting to an external device (col. 33, line 23. Note: a server is connected to clients, thus, there are connection units for connecting with clients).

Input means (the job request processing unit 37 in fig. 33, lines 30-32) for inputting an instruction (i.e., request) to execute a job (i.e., output data 711 in fig. 33(a) in data-output request 710 from clients, col. 33, lines 23-24);

Processing means (the data output control instruction 730 in fig. 33(b) for processing the job based on the instruction input by the input means (col. 33, lines 51-59);

Informing means for informing the external device of the result of job processing executed by the processing means through the connection means when the external device it to be informed of the result of the job processing.

informing means (26 in fig. 28) for informing the external device (25 in fig. 28) the data (from 35 in fig. 28) based on the job request of the client 25 through the connection means (note:

the job request processing unit 26 informs to client the data based on the job request from client 25).

However, Ohnishi does not teach input means (or informing means) for inputting whether the external device is to be informed of a result of a processing of the job; and informing when the external device is to be informed of the result of job processing.

Dash teaches input means for inputting an instruction to execute a job (col. 5, lines 30-39) and status requesting signal from the user interface for monitoring the status of the jobs from the external device (VCM 16 in fig. 2 or fig. 3) and then these result of status jobs is informed and displays to UI (col. 5, lines 53-67, col. 6, lines 39-45, col. 7, lines 45-60 and col. 11, lines 32-34).

It would have been obvious to have modified the input and informing means of Ohnishi for inputting the status message control signal from the user interface to the printer and get back the response message of the result of processing job as taught by Dash . The suggestion for modifying the system of Ohnishi can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Dash because Dash provides a system for a multifunctional printing system which controls a manner in which status message sets are displayed on a display screen of a corresponding user interface.

As to claim 7, Dash teaches storage means (74 in fig. 3) for storing the result of the job in correspondence with a type of the job (Type section in fig. 7), wherein the informing means informs the result of the job stored in the storage means.

As to claim 8, Dash teaches storage means stores the result of the job together with time information (see status section in fig. 7).

As to claim 9, Dash teaches the storage means selectively stores the result of the job according to the type of the job (see type of job section in fig. 7).

As to claim 10, Dash teaches the informing means informs the result of the job in response to an instruction provided from the external device connected to the connection means (col. 6, lines 39-45 and col. 11, lines 30-67).

As to claim 11, Ohnishi teaches the connection means is connected to a network for connecting a plurality of terminals, and the informing means (26 in fig. 28) informs the result of the job to one of the terminals (25 in fig. 28) connected to the network.

As to claim 12, Ohnishi teaches the informing means informs (26 in fig. 28) the result of the job in correspondence with a user inquiry (i.e., job request) made at the one of the terminal (25 in fig. 28).

As to claims 13 and 15, Dash teaches the method and program from a data processing apparatus (14 in fig. 2 and fig. 3) executing a job:

discriminating (from controller 44 in fig. 3) a result of a job executed by the data processing apparatus; and determining (from controller 34 in fig. 3) if an external device should be informed of the result based on an input (fig. 7 shows the result of the job, in Status section, is discriminated by 44 in fig. 3 and provided to the user for displaying, in col. 6, lines 39-43; and col. 7, lines 1-59).

informing an operation panel connected to the data processing apparatus of the discriminated result to the job if the determining step determines that the external device is to be informed of the result of the job (in fig.7, the graphical user interface with the screen in the

operation panel show the result of the jobs to the client, col. 5, lines 53-67 and col. 11, lines 32-34).

However, Dash does not teach a step for informing an external device connected to the data processing apparatus,

Ohnishi teaches informing means (26 in fig. 28) for providing a result of the job (from 35 in fig. 28) to the external device (25 in fig. 28) (note: the job request processing unit 26 informs to client the data based on the job request from client 25).

It would have been obvious to have modified the system of Dash for informing in the digital copying machine 93 for reporting the result of the job to the user as taught by Ohnishi. The suggestion for modifying the system of Dash can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth by Ohnishi because Ohnishi teaches the server can easily processing the job and provide the information of that job to a client by managing the information when the client or an output unit is connected to the server.

As to claim 14, Dash teaches a step of storing the result of the job in correspondence with a type of the job (see fig. 12); wherein the informing step informs the result of the job stored in the storing step (40 in fig. 32).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-5 are allowed.

Claim 1 is independent claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

As to claim 1, the combination of the closest prior arts of Ohnishi et al. (US Patent No. 5,655,152) and Dash et al. (US Patent No. 6,069,624) would not teach an apparatus for processing data transfer jobs in which a first memory that transfers the data for each of the plurality of jobs to an output device and inputs a selection of whether or not history information for at least one of the plurality of jobs is to be stored; a controller that, when a transfer of data from the first memory has ended for a given job, stored history information for the given job in the second memory in accordance with the input selection of whether of not history information for at least one of the plurality of jobs is to be stored and retrieves the history information from the second memory stored in accordance with the input selection and if the history information was stored.

Response to Arguments and Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed 2/25/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserted in page 9 " ...the cited art fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of ...an input means for inputting an instruction to execute a job and whether the external device is to be informed of a result of a processing of the job (claim 6) ". In reply, Ohnishi teaches input means (the job request processing unit 37 in fig. 33, lines 30-32) for inputting an instruction (i.e., request) to execute a job (i.e., output data 711 in fig. 33(a) in data-output request 710 from clients, col. 33, lines 23-24). Dash also teaches input means for inputting an instruction to execute a job (col. 5, lines 30-39) and status requesting signal from the user interface for monitoring the status of the jobs from the external device (VCM 16 in fig. 2 or

fig. 3) and then these result of status jobs is informed and displays to UI (col. 5, lines 53-67, col. 6, lines 39-45, col. 7, lines 45-60 and col. 11, lines 32-34).

Applicant asserted in page 10 " the cited art fails to teach or suggest at least the features of determining if an external device should be informed of the result based on an input; and informing an external device connected to the data processing apparatus of the discriminated result to the job if the determining step determines that the external device is to be informed of the result of the job." In reply, Dash teaches the method and program from a data processing apparatus (14 in fig. 2 and fig. 3) executing a job: discriminating (from controller 44 in fig. 3) a result of a job executed by the data processing apparatus; and determining (from controller 34 in fig. 3) if an external device should be informed of the result based on an input (fig. 7 shows the result of the job, in Status section, is discriminated by 44 in fig. 3 and provided to the user for displaying, in col. 6, lines 39-43; and col. 7, lines 1-59); informing an operation panel connected to the data processing apparatus of the discriminated result to the job if the determining step determines that the external device is to be informed of the result of the job (in fig.7, the graphical user interface with the screen in the operation panel show the result of the jobs to the client, col. 5, lines 53-67 and col. 11, lines 32-34). Ohnishi also teaches informing means (26 in fig. 28) for providing a result of the job (from 35 in fig. 28) to the external device (25 in fig. 28) (note: the job request processing unit 26 informs to client the data based on the job request from client 25).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the cited prior art fully discloses the claimed invention and the rejection stand.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas Q. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4857 or E-mail address is Douglas.tran@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Douglas Q. Tran
May. 18, 2002

JOSEPH MANCUSO
PRIMARY EXAMINER